arXiv:1703.02903v1 [quant-ph] 8 Mar 2017

Conditional quantum one-time pad

Kunal Sharma
Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA

Eyuri Wakakuwa
Graduate School of Informatics and Engineering, University of Electro-Communications, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofu-shi, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan

Mark M. Wilde
Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Center for Computation and Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA

(Dated: March 9, 2017)

Suppose that Alice and Bob are located in distant laboratories, which are connected by an ideal quantum channel. Suppose further that they share many copies of a quantum state ρ_{ABE}, such that Alice possesses the A systems and Bob the BE systems. In our model, there is an identifiable part of Bob's laboratory that is insecure: a third party named Eve has infiltrated Bob's laboratory and gained control of the E systems. Alice, knowing this, would like use their shared state and the ideal quantum channel to communicate a message in such a way that Bob, who has access to the whole of his laboratory (BE systems), can decode it, while Eve, who has access only to a sector of Bob's laboratory (E systems) and the ideal quantum channel connecting Alice to Bob, cannot learn anything about Alice's transmitted message. We call this task the conditional one-time pad, and in this paper, we prove that the optimal rate of secret communication for this task is equal to the conditional quantum mutual information $I(A;B|E)$ of their shared state. We thus give the conditional quantum mutual information an operational meaning that is different from those given in prior works, via state redistribution, conditional erasure, or state deconstruction. We also generalize the model and method in several ways, one of which demonstrates that the negative tripartite interaction information $-I_3(A;B;E) \equiv I(A;BE) - I(A;B) - I(A;E)$ of a tripartite state ρ_{ABE} is an achievable rate for a secret-sharing task, i.e., the case in which Alice's message should be secure from someone possessing only the AB or AE systems but should be decodable by someone possessing all systems A, B, and E.

Introduction—The main purpose of this paper is to show that the optimal rate of a communication task, which we call the conditional one-time pad, is equal to a fundamental information quantity called the conditional quantum mutual information. To prove this statement, we operate in the regime of quantum Shannon theory, and we suppose that Alice and Bob possess a large number n of copies of a quantum state ρ_{ABE}. We suppose that one party Alice has access to all of the A systems, and another party Bob has access to all of the BE systems. We suppose that Bob's laboratory is divided into two parts, one of which is secure (the B part) and the other which is insecure (the E part) and accessible to an eavesdropper Eve. We also suppose that Alice and Bob are connected by an ideal quantum channel, but the eavesdropper Eve can observe any quantum system that is transmitted over the ideal channel if she so desires. The goal of a conditional quantum one-time pad protocol is for Alice to encode a message m into her A systems, in such a way that if she sends her A systems over the ideal quantum channel, then

1. Bob can decode the message m reliably by performing a measurement on all of the ABE systems, while
2. an eavesdropper possessing the AE systems has essentially no chance of determining the message m if she tried to figure it out.

We prove that the optimal asymptotic rate at which this task can be accomplished is equal to the conditional quantum mutual information of the state ρ_{ABE}, defined as

$$I(A;B|E)_\rho \equiv I(A;BE)_\rho - I(A;E)_\rho, \tag{1}$$

where the quantum mutual information of a state σ_{FG} is defined as $I(F;G)_\sigma \equiv H(F)_\sigma + H(G)_\sigma - H(FG)_\sigma$, with $H(F)_\sigma \equiv -\operatorname{Tr}\{\sigma_F \log_2 \sigma_F\}$ denoting the quantum entropy.

Our main result thus gives an operational meaning to the conditional quantum mutual information (CQMI) that is conceptually different from those appearing in prior works [DY08, YD09, BBMW16]. CQMI has previously been interpreted as the optimal rate of quantum communication from a sender to a receiver to accomplish the task of state redistribution [DY08, YD09], in which the goal is for a sender to transmit one of her systems to a receiver who possesses a system correlated with the systems of the sender. CQMI has also been interpreted as the optimal rate of noise needed to accomplish the task of conditional erasure or state deconstruction [BBMW16], in which (briefly) the goal is to apply noise to the AE

systems of $\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ such that the resulting A systems are locally recoverable from the E systems alone while the marginal state $\rho_{BE}^{\otimes n}$ is negligibly disturbed.

The conditional mutual information is an information quantity that plays a central role in quantum information theory. The fact that it is non-negative for any quantum state is non-trivial and known as the strong subadditivity of quantum entropy [LR73b, LR73a]. The strong subadditivity inequality is at the core of nearly every coding theorem in quantum information theory (see, e.g., [Wil16]). The CQMI is also the information quantity underlying an entanglement measure called squashed entanglement [CW04], a quantum correlation measure called quantum discord [Zur00, OZ01] (as shown in [Pia12]), and a steering quantifier called intrinsic steerability [KWW16].

The basic intuition for the achievability of the conditional mutual information for the conditional one-time pad task is obtained by inspecting the expansion in (1) and is as follows: the authors of [SW06] showed that the quantum mutual information of a bipartite state is equal to the optimal rate of a task they called the (unconditional) quantum one-time pad. In our setting, the result of [SW06] implies that Alice can communicate a message secure against an eavesdropper, who can observe only the A systems, such that Bob, in possession of the BE systems, can decode it reliably, as long as the number of messages is $\approx nI(A;BE)_\rho$ bits. Here, we show that the message of Alice can be secured against an eavesdropper having access to both the A and E systems if Alice sacrifices $\approx nI(A;E)_\rho$ bits of the message, such that the total number of bits of the message is $\approx nI(A;BE)_\rho - nI(A;E)_\rho = nI(A;B|E)_\rho$, where we have employed (1). The main idea for a code construction to accomplish the above task is the same as that for the classical wiretap channel [Wyn75], which has been extended in a certain way to the quantum case in [Dev05, CWY04]. To prove the achievability part of the main result of our paper, we use a coding technique developed in [HDW08, Section III-A] and which was rediscovered shortly thereafter in [SW06] and later used in [DTW16]. We also employ tools which are standard by now, called quantum packing and covering lemmas (see, e.g., [Wil16]). To establish optimality of the CQMI for the conditional one-time pad task, we employ standard entropy inequalities. We note that the aforementioned methods also lead to a proof of the main result of [BO12], which concerns a kind of quantum one-time pad protocol different from that developed in [SW06] or the present paper.

A modification of the coding structure for the conditional one-time pad protocol allows us to establish that the negative tripartite interaction information

$$-I_3(A;B;E)_\rho \equiv I(A;BE)_\rho - I(A;B)_\rho - I(A;E)_\rho \quad (2)$$

of a tripartite state ρ_{ABE} is an achievable rate for a particular secret-sharing task that we call *information scrambling*. In this modified task, we suppose that Alice, Bob, and Eve are three distinct parties. Alice's laboratory is distant from Bob and Eve's, but we imagine that Bob and Eve's laboratories are close together, and an ideal quantum channel connects Alice's laboratory to Bob and Eve's. The goal of the information scrambling task is for Alice to communicate a message in such a way that it can be decoded only by someone who possesses all three ABE systems. If someone possesses only the AB systems or only the AE systems, then such a person can figure out essentially nothing about the encoded message. This achievability result establishes a direct connection between the negative interaction information and its use as a measure of scrambling, as advocated in [DHW16]. In particular, our finding shows that $-I_3(A;B;E)_\rho$ is an achievable rate for information scrambling, such that the message is encoded in the non-local degrees of freedom of $\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ and cannot be decoded exclusively from the local degrees of freedom, which in this case are constituted by systems AB or systems AE.

The rest of our paper proceeds as follows. We first formally define the conditional one-time pad task. After that, we establish the optimality part of our main result: that Alice cannot communicate at a rate higher than the conditional mutual information $I(A;B|E)$ while still satisfying the joint demands of reliable decoding for Bob (who gets the ABE systems) and security against an eavesdropper who has access to the AE systems. We then sketch a proof for the achievability part of our result, mostly by appealing to known techniques, the quantum packing and covering lemmas that are reviewed in [Wil16]. We finally discuss variations of the main task, such as the information scrambling task mentioned above and more general tasks, and then we conclude with a brief summary.

Conditional quantum one-time pad—We use notation and concepts standard in quantum information theory and point the reader to [Wil16] for further background. Let $n, M \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$. An $(n, M, \varepsilon, \delta)$ conditional one-time pad protocol begins with Alice and Bob sharing n copies of the state ρ_{ABE}, so that their state is $\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$. As mentioned previously, Bob has access to the BE systems, but we consider the E systems to be insecure and jointly accessible by an eavesdropper. Alice and Bob are connected by an ideal quantum channel, which Eve has access to as well (later we argue that it suffices for Alice and Bob to use only $\approx nH(A)_\rho$ ideal qubit channels, but for now we suppose that the ideal quantum channel can transmit as many qubits as desired). At the beginning of the protocol, Alice picks a message $m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and applies an encoding channel $\mathcal{E}^m_{A^n \to A'}$ to the A^n systems of $\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$, leading to the state $\omega^m_{A'B^nE^n} \equiv \mathcal{E}^m_{A^n\to A'}(\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n})$. She transmits the system A' of $\omega^m_{A'B^nE^n}$ over the ideal quantum channel. Bob applies a decoding positive operator-valued measure $\{\Lambda^m_{A'B^nE^n}\}_m$ to the systems $A'B^nE^n$ of $\omega^m_{A'B^nE^n}$ in order to figure out which message was transmitted. The protocol is ε-reliable if Bob can determine the message

m with probability not smaller than $1-\varepsilon$:

$$\forall m : \operatorname{Tr}\{\Lambda^m_{A'B^nE^n}\omega^m_{A'B^nE^n}\} \geq 1-\varepsilon. \tag{3}$$

The protocol is δ-secure if the reduced state $\omega^m_{A'E^n}$ on systems $A'E^n$ is nearly indistinguishable from a constant state $\sigma_{A'E^n}$ independent of the message m:

$$\forall m : \frac{1}{2}\left\|\omega^m_{A'E^n} - \sigma_{A'E^n}\right\|_1 \leq \delta, \tag{4}$$

where we have employed the normalized trace distance.

We say that a rate R is achievable for the conditional quantum one-time pad if for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$, $\gamma > 0$, and sufficiently large n, there exists an $(n, 2^{n[R-\gamma]}, \varepsilon, \delta)$ conditional one-time pad protocol of the above form. The conditional one-time pad capacity of a state ρ_{ABE} is equal to the supremum of all achievable rates.

Optimality of CQMI for conditional one-time pad—We first establish that the conditional one-time pad capacity of ρ_{ABE} cannot exceed $I(A;B|E)_\rho$. To see this, consider an arbitrary $(n, M, \varepsilon, \delta)$ protocol of the above form, and suppose that the message m is chosen uniformly at random. Then the overall state which describes all systems is

$$\omega_{\hat{M}A'B^nE^n} \equiv \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} |m\rangle\langle m|_{\hat{M}} \otimes \omega^m_{A'B^nE^n}, \tag{5}$$

where $\{|m\rangle_{\hat{M}}\}_m$ is an orthonormal basis. We can describe Bob's decoding measurement as a measurement channel $\mathcal{M}_{A'B^nE^n\to M'}(\theta_{A'B^nE^n}) \equiv \sum_m \operatorname{Tr}\{\Lambda^m_{A'B^nE^n}\theta_{A'B^nE^n}\}|m\rangle\langle m|_{M'}$, so that the final output state is

$$\omega_{\hat{M}M'} = \mathcal{M}_{A'B^nE^n\to M'}(\omega_{\hat{M}A'B^nE^n}). \tag{6}$$

By the condition in (3) and some further calculations, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\omega_{\hat{M}M'} - \overline{\Phi}_{\hat{M}M'}\right\|_1 \leq \varepsilon, \tag{7}$$

where $\overline{\Phi}_{\hat{M}M'} \equiv \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} |m\rangle\langle m|_{\hat{M}} \otimes |m\rangle\langle m|_{M'}$ is a maximally classically correlated state. A uniform bound for the continuity of mutual information [Win16] implies that

$$\log_2 M = I(\hat{M};M')_{\overline{\Phi}} \tag{8}$$

$$\leq I(\hat{M};M')_\omega + \varepsilon \log M + g(\varepsilon), \tag{9}$$

where $g(\varepsilon) \equiv (\varepsilon+1)\log_2(\varepsilon+1) - \varepsilon\log_2\varepsilon$, with the property that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} g(\varepsilon) = 0$ (see also [Wil16, Section 20.3.2]). From the Holevo bound [Hol73] or more generally quantum data processing (see, e.g., [Wil16, Section 11.9.2]), it follows that

$$I(\hat{M};M')_\omega \leq I(\hat{M};A'B^nE^n)_\omega. \tag{10}$$

By the condition in (4), it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|\omega_{\hat{M}A'E^n} - \omega_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{A'E^n}\right\|_1 \leq \delta, \tag{11}$$

which in turn implies from [Win16] that

$$I(\hat{M};A'E^n)_\omega \leq \delta\log M + g(\delta). \tag{12}$$

Putting everything together leads to the following bound:

$$\log_2 M \leq I(\hat{M};B^n|A'E^n)_\omega + (\varepsilon+\delta)\log M + g(\varepsilon) + g(\delta), \tag{13}$$

where we used that $I(\hat{M};A'B^nE^n)_\omega - I(\hat{M};A'E^n)_\omega = I(\hat{M};B^n|A'E^n)_\omega$. Now by several applications of the chain rule for conditional mutual information, we get that

$$I(\hat{M};B^n|A'E^n)_\omega$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(\hat{M};B_i|B^{i-1}A'E^n)_\omega \tag{14}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(\hat{M}A'B^{i-1}E^{i-1}E^n_{i+1};B_i|E_i)_\omega \tag{15}$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(A_i;B_i|E_i)_{\rho^{\otimes n}} \tag{16}$$

$$= nI(A;B|E)_\rho. \tag{17}$$

The second inequality follows because we can consider the sequential action of 1) tensoring in the states $\rho^{\otimes i-1}_{ABE}$ and $\rho^{\otimes n-i}_{ABE}$ to the ith copy of ρ_{ABE}, 2) tensoring in the state $\frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M}|m\rangle\langle m|_{\hat{M}}$, 3) applying the encoding $\mathcal{E}^m_{A^n\to A'}$ conditioned on the value m in $\hat{M}$, and 4) tracing over the systems B^n_{i+1} all as a local channel $\mathcal{N}_{A_i\to\hat{M}A'B^{i-1}E^{i-1}E^n_{i+1}}$ acting on the A_i system of $\rho_{A_iB_iE_i}$, so that

$$\omega_{\hat{M}A'B^{i-1}E^{i-1}B_iE_i} = \mathcal{N}_{A_i\to\hat{M}A'B^{i-1}E^{i-1}E^n_{i+1}}(\rho_{A_iB_iE_i}), \tag{18}$$

and the conditional mutual information does not increase under the action of a local channel on an unconditioned system [CW04]: $I(\hat{M}A'B^{i-1}E^{i-1};B_i|E_i)_\omega \leq I(A_i;B_i|E_i)_{\rho^{\otimes n}}$. Putting everything together, we find the following bound for any $(n, M, \varepsilon, \delta)$ conditional one-time pad protocol:

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon-\delta}{n}\log_2 M \leq I(A;B|E)_\rho + \frac{g(\varepsilon)+g(\delta)}{n}. \tag{19}$$

Taking the limit as $n\to\infty$ and then as $\varepsilon,\delta\to 0$ allows us to conclude that the conditional mutual information $I(A;B|E)_\rho$ is an upper bound on the conditional one-time pad capacity of ρ_{ABE}.

Achievability of CQMI for conditional one-time pad—Here we mostly sketch an argument that the CQMI $I(A;B|E)_\rho$ is a lower bound on the conditional one-time pad capacity of ρ_{ABE}, given that the tools to prove this are standard by now. First, consider the reduced state ρ_A and a spectral decomposition for it as $\rho_A = \sum_x p_X(x)|x\rangle\langle x|_A$, where p_X is a probability distribution and $\{|x\rangle_A\}_x$ is an orthonormal basis. Let

$|\phi\rangle_{AR} = \sum_x \sqrt{p_X(x)}|x\rangle_A|x\rangle_R$ be a purification of ρ_A. Let $|\psi\rangle_{ABEF}$ denote a purification of ρ_{ABE}, with F playing the role of a purifying system. Since all purifications are related by an isometry acting on the purifying system, there exists an isometry $U_{R\to BEF}$ such that $U_{R\to BEF}|\phi\rangle_{AR} = |\psi\rangle_{ABEF}$. Applying the isometry $U_{R\to BEF}$ followed by a partial trace over F can be thought of as a channel $\mathcal{N}_{R\to BE}$ that realizes the state ρ_{ABE} as $\mathcal{N}_{R\to BE}(\phi_{AR}) = \rho_{ABE}$. Similarly, if we apply the isometry $U_{R\to BEF}$ and trace over FB, then this is a channel $\mathcal{M}_{R\to E}$ that realizes the reduced state ρ_{AE} as $\mathcal{M}_{R\to E}(\phi_{AR}) = \rho_{AE}$.

If we take n copies of ρ_{ABE}, then the state $\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ can be thought of as the following state $\mathcal{N}_{R\to BE}^{\otimes n}(\phi_{AR}^{\otimes n})$. The pure state $|\phi\rangle_{AR}^{\otimes n}$ admits an information-theoretic type decomposition of the following form, as discussed in [Wil16, Section 21.4]

$$|\phi\rangle_{AR}^{\otimes n} = \sum_t \sqrt{p(t)}|\Phi_t\rangle_{A^nR^n}, \tag{20}$$

where the label t indicates a type class and $|\Phi_t\rangle_{A^nR^n}$ is a maximally entangled state of Schmidt rank d_t with support on the type class subspace labeled by t. We can then consider forming encoding unitaries out of the generalized Pauli shift and phase-shift operators $V_{A^n}(x_t, z_t) = X_{A^n}(x_t)Z_{A^n}(z_t)$, which act on a given type class subspace t and where $x_t, z_t \in \{0, \ldots, d_t - 1\}$. The overall encoding unitary allows for an additional phase $(-1)^{b_t}$ for $b_t \in \{0, 1\}$ and has the form $U_{A^n}(s) = \bigoplus_t (-1)^{b_t} V_{A^n}(x_t, z_t)$, where s is a vector $((b_t, x_t, z_t)_t)$. These encoding unitaries have very nice properties as discussed at length in [Wil16, Section 21.4] and will be useful for our purposes here.

The coding scheme is based on random coding, as is usually the case in quantum Shannon theory, and works as follows. Let $M, K \in \mathbb{N}$. Alice has a message variable $m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and a local key variable $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. For each pair (m, k), Alice picks a vector s of the form described previously uniformly at random and labels it as $s(m, k)$. The set $\mathcal{C} = \{s(m, k)\}_{m,k}$ constitutes the code and observe that it is initially selected randomly. If Alice wishes to send message m, then she picks k uniformly at random from $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$, applies the encoding unitary $U_{A^n}(s(m, k))$ to the state $\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}$ and sends the A^n systems to Bob. Bob's goal is to decode both the message variable m and the local key variable k. Based on the packing lemma [Wil16, Chapter 16] and the development in [Wil16, Section 21.4], it follows that if $\log_2 MK \approx nI(A; BE)_\rho$, then there is a decoding measurement $\{\Lambda_{A^nB^nE^n}^{m,k}\}$ for Bob, constructed from typical projectors and corresponding to a particular selected code $\mathcal{C}$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}}\left\{\frac{1}{MK}\sum_{m,k}\operatorname{Tr}\{\Lambda_{A^nB^nE^n}^{m,k}U_{A^n}(S(m,k))\rho_{ABE}^{\otimes n}\times U_{A^n}^\dagger(S(m,k))\}\right\} \geq 1-\varepsilon, \tag{21}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and sufficiently large n, and where the expectation is with respect to the random choice of code $\mathcal{C}$. On the other hand, from the perspective of someone who does not know the choice of k and who does not have access to the systems B^n, the state has the following form:

$$\tau_{A^nE^n}^m \equiv \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^K U_{A^n}(s(m,k))\rho_{AE}^{\otimes n}U_{A^n}^\dagger(s(m,k)). \tag{22}$$

The quantum covering lemma reviewed in [Wil16, Chapter 17] and the properties of typical projectors guarantee that

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\{\|\tau_{A^nE^n}^m - \overline{\tau}_{A^nE^n}\|_1 \leq \delta + 4\sqrt{\delta} + 24\sqrt[4]{\delta}\} \geq 1 - 2D\exp\left(-\frac{\delta^3 K 2^{-n[I(A;E)_\rho+\delta']}}{4\ln 2}\right), \tag{23}$$

where D is a parameter that is no more than exponential in n, $\delta' > 0$ is a small constant, and

$$\overline{\tau}_{A^nE^n} \equiv \mathbb{E}_S\left\{U_{A^n}(S)\rho_{AE}^{\otimes n}U_{A^n}^\dagger(S)\right\}. \tag{24}$$

Thus, as long as we pick $\log_2 K \approx nI(A; E)_\rho$, then there is an extremely good chance that the state $\tau_{A^nE^n}^m$ will be nearly indistinguishable from the average state $\overline{\tau}_{A^nE^n}$. Proceeding along the lines of [Wil16, Section 23.3], we can define the event E_0 to be the event that Bob's measurement decodes with high average success probability and the event E_m to be the event that $\|\tau_{A^nE^n}^m - \overline{\tau}_{A^nE^n}\|_1$ is small. The union bound of probability theory then guarantees that there is a non-zero probability for there to be a code $\{s(m, k)\}_{m,k}$ such that the average success probability of Bob's decoder is arbitrarily high and $\|\tau_{A^nE^n}^m - \overline{\tau}_{A^nE^n}\|_1$ is arbitrarily small for all m, with these statements holding for sufficiently large n. So this means that such a code $\{s(m, k)\}_{m,k}$ exists. A final "expurgation" argument identical to that in [Wil16, Section 23.3.4] guarantees that Bob can decode each m and k with arbitrarily high probability and that $\|\tau_{A^nE^n}^m - \overline{\tau}_{A^nE^n}\|_1$ is arbitrarily small for all m. The number of bits that Alice can communicate securely is thus $\log_2 M = \log_2 MK - \log_2 K \approx nI(A; BE)_\rho - nI(A; E)_\rho = nI(A; B|E)_\rho$, so that $I(A; B|E)_\rho$ is an achievable rate. This concludes the achievability proof.

We note that it actually suffices to use $\approx nH(A)_\rho$ noiseless qubit channels for the communication of the A systems, rather than $n \log |A|$ noiseless qubit channels.

This is because Alice can perform Schumacher compression [Sch95] of her A^n systems before transmitting them, and the structure of the encoding unitaries is such that this can be done regardless of which message is being transmitted (see the discussion at the end of [Wil16, Section 22.3]). The Schumacher compression causes a negligible disturbance to each of the states that is transmitted.

Conditional one-time pad of a quantum message—We note that it is possible to define a conditional quantum one-time pad of a quantum message, in which the goal is to transmit one share $\hat{M}$ of a quantum state $|\varphi\rangle_{M''\hat{M}}$ securely in such a way that Bob, possessing systems $A'B^nE^n$ can decode the quantum message in $\hat{M}$, while someone possessing the systems $A'E^n$ cannot learn anything about the quantum system $\hat{M}$. Our result here is that $I(A;B|E)_\rho/2$ is the optimal rate for this task of conditional one-time pad of a quantum message. The optimality proof is nearly identical to the optimality proof given previously, except we start with the assumption that the initial state $|\varphi\rangle_{M''\hat{M}}$ is a maximally entangled state $|\Phi\rangle_{M''\hat{M}}$, such that the quantum information in system $\hat{M}$ can be decoded well. Then, the proof starts with the condition that $\log_2 M = I(M'';\hat{M})_\Phi/2$ and proceeds identically from there. For the achievability part, we perform a coherent version of the above protocol, as reviewed in [Wil16, Section 22.4], and we find that it generates coherent bits [Har04], which are secure from someone possessing the A^nE^n systems, at a rate equal to $I(A;B|E)_\rho$. By the coherent communication identity from [Har04], it follows that qubits can be transmitted securely at a rate equal to $I(A;B|E)_\rho/2$.

Generalizations—We note that the coding scheme outlined above in the achievability proof can be generalized in several interesting ways. Suppose that Alice shares a state with "many Bobs", i.e., one of the form $\rho_{AB_1\cdots B_\ell}$ for some positive integer $\ell \geq 2$. Then Alice might wish to encode a message m in her A systems of $\rho_{AB_1\cdots B_\ell}^{\otimes n}$ in such a way that only someone possessing all of the systems $AB_1\cdots B_\ell$ would be able to decode it, but someone possessing system A and some subset $\mathcal{B}_i \in \{B_1,\ldots,B_\ell\}$ would not be able to determine anything about the message m. Alice might wish to protect the message against several different subsets $\mathcal{B}_i$, for $i \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$, as in secret sharing. Then we could structure a coding scheme similar to our achievability proof above to have a message variable $m \in \{1,\ldots,M\}$ and p local key variables $k_i \in \{1,\ldots,K_i\}$, such that $\log_2 MK_1\cdots K_p \approx nI(A;B_1\cdots B_\ell)$ and $\log_2 K_i \approx nI(A;\mathcal{B}_i)$. Then if the information quantity $I(A;B_1\cdots B_\ell)_\rho - \sum_{i=1}^p I(A;\mathcal{B}_i)_\rho$ is strictly positive, the coding scheme guarantees that this information difference is an achievable rate that accomplishes the desired task.

A particular case of interest is the scenario mentioned earlier in the paper and which we called information scrambling, due to its connection with the work in [DHW16]. There, Alice, Bob, and Eve share a state ρ_{ABE} and the goal is for Alice to encode a message in the A system such that someone possessing the ABE systems can decode it, but someone possessing the AB systems or the AE systems cannot determine anything about the message m (i.e., the message m has been scrambled in the nonlocal degrees of freedom of the state ρ_{ABE} and is not available in ρ_{AB} or ρ_{AE}). According to the above reasoning, an achievable rate for this task is the negative tripartite interaction information $-I_3(A;B;E)_\rho = I(A;BE)_\rho - I(A;B)_\rho - I(A;E)_\rho$, if it is strictly non-negative. In our opinion, this interpretation provides further evidence in addition to that given in [DHW16] that the negative tripartite interaction information is a quantity relevant to study in the context of scrambling. We note that the discussion here bears some similarities to the discussion in [KFM16, Section IV], but our approach here seems to lead more directly to information quantities such as interaction information.

We note also that our methods gives a concrete and transparent approach to prove the results of [BO12]. In particular, we have established an information-theoretic converse of that result using entropy identities and inequalities along the lines presented previously, and the achievability part of that result can be accomplished by using the encoding unitaries discussed earlier along with the quantum packing and covering lemmas reviewed in [Wil16]. This will be presented in full detail later.

Our operational interpretation of the conditional mutual information also leads to an interesting operational interpretation of the squashed entanglement of a bipartite state ρ_{AB}: we can consider squashed entanglement to be the optimal rate of secure communication in the conditional one-time pad if an eavesdropper has the E system of the worst possible extension ρ_{ABE} of the state ρ_{AB}, given that squashed entanglement is defined as $\inf_{\rho_{ABE}}\{I(A;B|E)_\rho : \mathrm{Tr}_E\{\rho_{ABE}\} = \rho_{AB}\}$ [CW04]. This is analogous to the interpretations from [Opp08] and the follow-up one in [BBMW16].

Conclusion—In this paper, we proved that the conditional mutual information $I(A;B|E)_\rho$ of a tripartite state ρ_{ABE} is equal to the optimal rate of secure communication for a task that we call the conditional one-time pad. This represents a fundamentally different operational interpretation of conditional mutual information that is conceptually simple at the same time. We were able to prove this result by employing some standard techniques in quantum information theory, which are reviewed at length in [Wil16]. In the continuing quest to understand a refined generalization of conditional mutual information, as has been attempted previously in [BSW15, DHO14, BCT16, ADJ14], the protocol of conditional one-time pad might end up being helpful in this effort.

We especially thank David Ding for suggesting to think about the connection of conditional one-time pad to scrambling. We also thank Rahul Jain for discussions about wiretap channels. MMW acknowledges support from the Office of Naval Research and the National Science Foundation.

[ADJ14] Anurag Anshu, Vamsi Krishna Devabathini, and Rahul Jain. Quantum message compression with applications. October 2014. arXiv:1410.3031.

[BBMW16] Mario Berta, Fernando G. S. L. Brandao, Christian Majenz, and Mark M. Wilde. Deconstruction and conditional erasure of quantum correlations. September 2016. arXiv:1609.06994.

[BCT16] Mario Berta, Matthias Christandl, and Dave Touchette. Smooth entropy bounds on one-shot quantum state redistribution. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(3):1425–1439, March 2016. arXiv:1409.4338.

[BO12] Fernando G. S. L. Brandao and Jonathan Oppenheim. Quantum one-time pad in the presence of an eavesdropper. *Physical Review Letters*, 108(4):040504, January 2012. arXiv:1004.3328.

[BSW15] Mario Berta, Kaushik Seshadreesan, and Mark M. Wilde. Rényi generalizations of the conditional quantum mutual information. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 56(2):022205, February 2015. arXiv:1403.6102.

[CW04] Matthias Christandl and Andreas Winter. "Squashed entanglement" - an additive entanglement measure. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 45(3):829–840, March 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0308088.

[CWY04] Ning Cai, Andreas Winter, and Raymond W. Yeung. Quantum privacy and quantum wiretap channels. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 40(4):318–336, October 2004.

[Dev05] Igor Devetak. The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(1):44–55, January 2005. arXiv:quant-ph/0304127.

[DHO14] Nilanjana Datta, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, and Jonathan Oppenheim. An upper bound on the second order asymptotic expansion for the quantum communication cost of state redistribution. September 2014. arXiv:1409.4352.

[DHW16] Dawei Ding, Patrick Hayden, and Michael Walter. Conditional mutual information of bipartite unitaries and scrambling. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2016(12):145, December 2016. arXiv:1608.04750.

[DTW16] Nilanjana Datta, Marco Tomamichel, and Mark M. Wilde. On the second-order asymptotics for entanglement-assisted communication. *Quantum Information Processing*, 15(6):2569–2591, June 2016. arXiv:1405.1797.

[DY08] Igor Devetak and Jon Yard. Exact cost of redistributing multipartite quantum states. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(23):230501, June 2008.

[Har04] Aram Harrow. Coherent communication of classical messages. *Physical Review Letters*, 92(9):097902, March 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0307091.

[HDW08] Min-Hsiu Hsieh, Igor Devetak, and Andreas Winter. Entanglement-assisted capacity of quantum multiple-access channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(7):3078–3090, July 2008. arXiv:quant-ph/0511228.

[Hol73] Alexander S. Holevo. Bounds for the quantity of information transmitted by a quantum communication channel. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 9:177–183, 1973.

[KFM16] Kohtaro Kato, Fabian Furrer, and Mio Murao. Information-theoretical analysis of topological entanglement entropy and multipartite correlations. *Physical Review A*, 93(2):022317, February 2016. arXiv:1505.01917.

[KWW16] Eneet Kaur, Xiaoting Wang, and Mark M. Wilde. Conditional mutual information and quantum steering. December 2016. arXiv:1612.03875.

[LR73a] Elliott H. Lieb and Mary Beth Ruskai. A fundamental property of quantum-mechanical entropy. *Physical Review Letters*, 30(10):434–436, March 1973.

[LR73b] Elliott H. Lieb and Mary Beth Ruskai. Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum-mechanical entropy. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 14(12):1938–1941, December 1973.

[Opp08] Jonathan Oppenheim. A paradigm for entanglement theory based on quantum communication. January 2008. arXiv:0801.0458.

[OZ01] Harold Ollivier and Wojciech H. Zurek. Quantum discord: A measure of the quantumness of correlations. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(1):017901, December 2001. arXiv:quant-ph/0105072.

[Pia12] Marco Piani. Problem with geometric discord. *Physical Review A*, 86(3):034101, September 2012. arXiv:1206.0231.

[Sch95] Benjamin Schumacher. Quantum coding. *Physical Review A*, 51(4):2738–2747, April 1995.

[SW06] Benjamin Schumacher and Michael D. Westmoreland. Quantum mutual information and the one-time pad. *Physical Review A*, 74(4):042305, October 2006. arXiv:quant-ph/0604207.

[Wil16] Mark M. Wilde. *From Classical to Quantum Shannon Theory*. March 2016. arXiv:1106.1445v7.

[Win16] Andreas Winter. Tight uniform continuity bounds for quantum entropies: conditional entropy, relative entropy distance and energy constraints. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 347(1):291–313, October 2016. arXiv:1507.07775.

[Wyn75] Aaron D. Wyner. The wire-tap channel. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 54(8):1355–1387, October 1975.

[YD09] Jon Yard and Igor Devetak. Optimal quantum source coding with quantum side information at the encoder and decoder. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(11):5339–5351, November 2009. arXiv:0706.2907.

[Zur00] Wojciech H. Zurek. Einselection and decoherence from an information theory perspective. *Annalen der Physik*, 9(11-12):855–864, November 2000. arXiv:quant-ph/0011039.